

REMARKS

The following remarks are provided in response to the Office Action (“office action”) mailed October 21, 2008 in which the office action:

- rejected claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13-17, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,839,125 to Hansen (hereinafter Hansen).
- rejected claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub. 2004/0201831 to Tyminski (hereinafter Tyminski).
- rejected claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 17, 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,452,662 to Mulkens et al. (hereinafter Mulkens).
- rejected claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub. 2004/0022068 to Shiozawa (hereinafter Shiozawa).
- rejected claims 11-16, 18-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulkens alone or in view of US Pub. 2004/0265707 to Socha (hereinafter Socha).

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13-17, 21 and 23 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 13-17, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen. The Applicants herein cancel claims 5, 10 and 15. The Applicants herein amend independent claim 1, from which claims 7 and 8 depend, herein amend independent claim 11, from which claims 13-14 and 16 depend, and herein amend

independent claim 17, from which claims 21 and 23 depend. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 7, 8, 13-14, 16-17, 21 and 23 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

Independent claim 1 is directed at a light source and has been amended to include the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape.”

(See Applicants’ specification, e.g., paragraphs 0020 and 0027 and Figures 2 and 4.)

Independent claims 11 and 17 have been amended to include similar elements. That is, in claims 1, 7, 8, 13-14, 16-17, 21 and 23, the Applicants teach and claim a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Hansen fails to disclose a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Hansen does disclose a single set of poles. However, each pole in the set of poles of Hansen has the same shape as the other poles in the set of poles. (See, Hansen, e.g., Figs. 4, 5, 12, 14b, and related text.) Thus, even if the single set of poles of Hansen were arbitrarily viewed as two sets of poles, each pole of both sets of poles would have the same shape. As such, Hansen fails to disclose a light source that includes the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape,” as taught and

claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 7, 8, 13-14, 16-17, 21 and 23.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 10 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tyminski. The Applicants herein cancel claims 5 and 10. The Applicants herein amend independent claim 1, from which claims 7 and 8 depend. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 7 and 8 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

Independent claim 1 is directed at a light source and has been amended to include the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape.” (See Applicants’ specification, e.g., paragraphs 0020 and 0027 and Figures 2 and 4.)

Tyminski fails to disclose a light source that includes the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape,” as taught and claimed by the Applicants. Tyminski does disclose a light source having two sets of poles. For example, in Fig. 10, Tyminski discloses a central circular pole with four outer triangular poles. However, the outer triangular poles of Tyminski do not have an arc shape in the

manner taught and claimed by the Applicants. (See, Tyminski, e.g., Fig. 10 and related text.) Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 8.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 17, 26 and 29 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 17, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mulkens. The Applicants herein cancel claims 5, and 10. The Applicants herein amend independent claim 1, from which claims 3 and 6-8 depend, herein amend independent claim 17, and herein amend independent claim 26, from which claim 29 depends. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 26 and 29 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

Independent claim 1 is directed at a light source and has been amended to include the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape.”

(See Applicants’ specification, e.g., paragraphs 0020 and 0027 and Figures 2 and 4.)

Independent claims 17 and 26 have been amended to include similar elements. That is, in claims 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 26 and 29, the Applicants teach and claim a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Mulkens fails to disclose a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Mulkens does disclose a single set of poles. However, each pole in the set of poles of Mulkens has the same shape as the other poles in the set of poles. (See, Mulkens, e.g., Figs. 8, 17, 25a and 25b, and related text.) Thus, even if the single set of poles of Mulkens were viewed as two sets of poles (see, Mulkens, e.g., Figs. 25a and 25b), each pole of both sets of poles would have the same shape. As such, Mulkens fails to disclose a light source that includes the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape,” as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-8, 17, 26 and 29.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 17 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shiozawa. The Applicants herein cancel claims 5 and 10. The Applicants herein amend independent claim 1, from which claims 7 and 8 depend, and herein amend independent claim 17. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1, 7, 8 and 17 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

Independent claim 1 is directed at a light source and has been amended to include the elements, “a first set of poles..., **wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape**” and “a second set of poles..., **wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape.**”

(See Applicants' specification, e.g., paragraphs 0020 and 0027 and Figures 2 and 4.)

Independent claim 17 has been amended to include similar elements. That is, in claims 1, 7, 8 and 17, the Applicants teach and claim a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Shiozawa fails to disclose a light source having two sets of poles, each pole of the first set of poles having a different shape than each pole of the second set of poles.

Shiozawa does disclose a single set of poles. However, each pole in the set of poles of Shiozawa has the same shape as the other poles in the set of poles. (See, Shiozawa, e.g., Figs. 6, 7, 9, 17, 18A-C and 20A-C, and related text.) Thus, even if the single set of poles of Shiozawa were arbitrarily viewed as two sets of poles, each pole of both sets of poles would have the same shape. As such, Shiozawa fails to disclose a light source that includes the elements, "*a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape*" and "*a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape,*" as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 7, 8 and 17.

Claims 11-16, 18-25, 27 and 28 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11-16, 18-25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulkens alone or in view of Socha. The Applicants herein cancel

claims 15, 20, 27 and 28. The Applicants herein amend independent claim 11, from which claims 12-14 and 16 depend, and herein amend independent claim 17, from which claims 18-19 and 21-25 depend. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 11-14, 16, 18-19 and 21-25 in view of the amendments and the following arguments.

Independent claim 11 is directed at a light source and has been amended to include the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape.” (See Applicants’ specification, e.g., paragraphs 0020 and 0027 and Figures 2 and 4.) Independent claim 17 has been amended to include similar elements.

As described above, Mulkens fails to disclose a light source that includes the elements, “a first set of poles..., wherein each pole of the first set of poles has an arc shape” and “a second set of poles..., wherein each pole of the second set of poles has a shape selected from the group consisting of a circular shape and an elliptical shape,” as taught and claimed by the Applicants. The Applicants herein assert that Socha fails to cure the deficiencies of Mulkens. Socha does disclose a light source having pole arrangements with varying shapes. However, the poles of Socha do not have an arc shape, a circular shape or an elliptical shape in the manner taught and claimed by the Applicants. (See, Socha, e.g., Figs. 10A-B and 11A-B, and related text.)

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 8.

New Claims 30-33

New claims 30-33 depend from independent claim 1. The Applicants respectfully request consideration of new claims 30-33 in view of the amendments to and above arguments regarding claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants submit that they have overcome the office action's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as set forth in the listed claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), the Applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

/Justin K. Brask/

January 20, 2009

Date

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073

Justin K. Brask
Reg. No. 61,080